



# N810 Newsletter



## Updates from the Requirements and Acquisition Branch and Navy JROC POC

February 2000

Vol 2/Issue 2

### Change In Policy For Submission Of MNS/CRD/ORD Comments:

The Joint Staff is implementing a web-based "JROC Assessment Tool" (ref JROCSM 011-00 of 24 Jan 2000) for the submission of comments on all requirements documents (MNSs/CRDs/ORDs). Use of this web-based system is **mandatory** for all commenting CINCs/Services/Agencies.

To comply with this system, we must adhere to the following standards for submission of comments. Hence, from now on, any comments you submit to N810 for any and all MNSs/CRDs/ORDs must be provided in the following manner:

1. **All comments must be submitted electronically.** You will continue to determine the level within your office that your comments will be approved. **However, we request that you include, in your forwarding email, the name and code of the person in your organization who approved the release of the comments.**

2. **Comments must be forwarded to us by e-mail in a Word document in tabular form** to be compatible with the JROC Assessment Tool. **(Format included below.)** This matrix must have 7 columns with the categories of: Originator, Page #, Para #, Line #, Classification, Comments, and A/R/P.

ORG	Pg #	Par #	Line	Class	Comm	A/R/P
USN	3	2.a	2	U	Critical	
USN	14	Fig 1		U	Admin	
USN	Gen			U	Subs	
.	.	.	.	.	.	.
.	.	.	.	.	.	.

#### Notes:

a. Regardless of your OPNAV N-code, "USN" should be in the originator column.

b. Para # and Line # are only filled in if applicable.

c. Classification pertains to the specific

comment and should normally be "S" for Secret, "C" for Confidential, or "U" for Unclassified.

d. In the Comments column, each comment should be characterized as Critical, Substantive, or Administrative. Remember that, in practice, a critical comment is a "non-concur". Each comment must be accompanied by Rationale.

e. The A/R/P column stands for Accepted, Rejected, or Partial-- leave it blank. It will be completed later by the document sponsor using the JROC Assessment Tool. The sponsor may also include Sponsor's rationale for accepting/rejecting the comment, in the form of an editorial comment.

f. All comments must be submitted using Bookman Old Style font, 12 point.

Attached is a Word 97 document (a table in landscape format) that provides a **sample table.**

3. To maintain consistency and to avoid generating separate procedures for programs that do or do not go to JROC, we will require the same procedures to be followed for submitting comments for all ACAT levels.

4. The Joint Staff currently allows only one office from each Service to access the JROC Assessment Tool web site. N810, as the Navy JROC POC, will be this office. However, we hope to soon have the ability to issue user names and passwords to Navy sponsors of documents going to JROC. This will allow the cognizant action officer(s) to have immediate visibility on comments posted by CINCs, the Joint Staff, other Services, and Agencies as they come available, and should reduce cycle times.

5. **This policy goes into effect immediately.** Please forward this information as necessary to ensure the widest

dissemination to all Action Officers, Administrative Staff, and others who review and comment on MNSs, CRDs, and ORDs.

### Selecting Key Performance Parameters (KPPs)

N810 gets a lot of questions regarding the selection of performance parameters, including KPPs. While we understand that ideally, all KPPs are based in a firm analytical foundation through a well-constructed analysis of alternatives, we realize that this is not always the case.

Differences in the viewpoints and responsibilities of various service and joint organizations can lead to advocacy for the establishment of a KPP that will resolve the particular advocate's issue if it is incorporated into an ORD. For example, on one hand resource sponsors and program managers often raise issues that are driven by a desire to minimize cost during the development and procurement phases, since they are incentivized by operating within front-end budget constraints. On the other hand, we get comments from the logistics community, whose operation and maintenance budgets can be adversely impacted by resource sponsor or program manager decisions and trade-offs. Specifically, the program manager and resource sponsor may be willing to trade off R&D work intended to engineer life cycle affordability into the front end of a program, so that the program front-end costs can be kept below a programming threshold. While this may make sense from the point of view of keeping the program milestones on track, it may cause the total ownership cost of the program to increase, making it a worse deal for the Navy.

This tendency has caused the logistics community to want to include O&S costs and selected reliability, maintainability and

availability metrics as KPPs. While we in N810 understand the motivation behind this proclivity, our job is to make sure the KPP will achieve the intended objective. To assist us in this endeavor, we ask anyone who proposes an additional KPP be added to a program answer a few basic questions:

- What is the objective you are trying to achieve with this KPP? If you can't articulate the objective, you will not be able to measure success.

- How will this KPP enable you to meet your objective?

- How is your KPP defined? What elements go into your KPP?

- How will your KPP be measured? Are the sub-elements that go into your KPP measurable real-time? Or will you have to rely on predictive measures? If you will rely on predictive measures, how sure are you that those measures have any correlation to the program in question?

- How will your KPP be tested? Don't say "that's the testing community's problem," if you can't articulate a meaningful testing strategy, chances are that the testing community won't be able to either.

Remember the old saw: if you don't know where you're going, any path will get you there. If you can't articulate what you want out of your KPP, then any KPP will do. Conversely, if you can't articulate your ultimate goal and how your proposed KPP will get you there, then N810 will have difficulty providing support for your position when advising N8 and the approval chain.

### Test and Evaluation Master Plan (TEMP) Procedures

The TEMP documents the overall structure and objectives of the test and evaluation program. The TEMP identifies the necessary developmental test and evaluation, operational test and evaluation, and live fire test and evaluation activities. It relates program schedule, test management strategy and structure, and required resources to: Critical operational issues; Critical technical parameters; Objectives and thresholds derived from the ORD; Evaluation criteria; and Milestone decision points.

For multi-Service or joint programs, a single integrated TEMP is required.

Component-unique content requirements, particularly evaluation criteria associated with critical operational issues, can be addressed in a Component-prepared annex to the basic TEMP. For a program consisting of a collection of individual systems, a Capstone TEMP integrating the test and evaluation program for the entire system is required. System-unique content requirements are addressed in an annex to the basic Capstone TEMP. The requirement for a Capstone TEMP is dependent upon the degree of integration and interoperability required to satisfy the total system's objectives and thresholds.

Final TEMP approval should occur at least 30 days prior to the applicable testing or the next milestone. Accordingly, the Developing Activity (DA) should allow 30 days for COMOPTEVFOR and OPNAV to review the draft and 30 days to incorporate review comments and to route the TEMP for signatures. For OSD oversight programs, a draft TEMP shall be submitted to OSD at least 65 days prior and a Navy-approved smooth TEMP 30 days (for final signature review) prior to the next milestone event.

### TEMP Responsibilities

CNO (N091) is the principal interface between CNO and Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Research, Development & Acquisition (ASN(RD&A))), on matters relating to T&E. Responsibilities include the following:

- a. Acting for CNO in resolving T&E issues.

- b. Establishing and issuing policy regarding conduct of operational T&E.

- c. Coordinating T&E document preparation.

- d. Providing principal liaison with the Commander, Operational Test and Evaluation Force (COMOPTEVFOR) on operational test requirements and execution.

- e. Acting for CNO as the single point of contact for interface with DoD's Director, Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E) for test and evaluation master plan (TEMP) and test plan coordination and approval.

- f. Serving as the OPNAV point of contact with OSD on joint service testing matters.

- g. Coordinating operational test and evaluation (OT&E) support for the United States Marine Corps (USMC).

- h. CNO (N091) is designated as the Navy Live-Firing T&E primary point of contact.

### TEMP Drafting/Submitting

The DA drafts the TEMP with RO and COMOPTEVFOR participation. The entire draft TEMP is sent to CNO (N912) for OPNAV review (ACAT I, II, and III). ACAT IVT draft TEMPs shall be sent to the applicable program sponsor for review and to COMOPTEVFOR for review and endorsement.


1. Requirements developed in the analysis of alternatives and incorporated in the ORD shall be listed in the TEMP.

2. N912 shall distribute copies of the draft TEMP to the applicable program sponsor, N4, N6, N8, and ASN(RD&A) for review and comment.

All comments shall be returned to N912 for review and consolidation. N912 shall send consolidated TEMP comments, with rationale for all recommended changes, to the DA for incorporation into the final TEMP. If the program is subject to OSD T&E oversight, N912 shall deliver appropriate copies to OSD. N091 will resolve specific issues, and after resolution, the DA and COMOPTEVFOR shall sign and date the smooth TEMP and submit it to the program sponsor to continue the approval process.

The DA distributes approved TEMPs to all appropriate offices and commands.

---

Contact N810 with your questions, suggestions, or comments at:  (703) 614-7271 / 8 / 9

Or by e-mail:

CDR Bill Toti	N810	- toti.william@hq.navy.mil
CDR John Ingram	N810B	- ingram.john@hq.navy.mil
LCDR Rafael Matos	N810E	- matos.rafael@hq.navy.mil
LCDR Kelly Cormican	N810F	- cormican.kelly@hq.navy.mil

Visit our Web Page on the SIPRNET in the OPNAV SIPRNET: (<http://ww2.monavysmil.mil>) by following the links to N81, Assessment Division, and then to N810, Requirements and Acquisition Branch

---

## UNCLASSIFIED

<b>ORG</b>	<b>Page #</b>	<b>Para #</b>	<b>Line #</b>	<b>Class</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>A/R/P</b>
USN	3	2a		U	<b>Critical:</b> ..... Rationale: .....	
USN	General			U	<b>Substantive:</b> ..... Rationale: .....	
USN	14	Figure 4		U	<b>Admin:</b> ..... Rationale: .....	